UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/732,085	12/06/2000	Daniel J. Miller	MS1-642US	3091

22801 7590 10/03/2003

LEE & HAYES PLLC
421 W RIVERSIDE AVENUE SUITE 500
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER	
TRUONG, LECHI	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2126	3

DATE MAILED: 10/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/732,085	WILLIAMS, MITCH A.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	LeChi Truong	2126	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE ____ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *06 December 2000* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *1-33* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *2* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. Claims **1, 10, 11, 19** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beranek et al (US. Patent 6,226,642 B1) in view of Berstis et al (US. Patent 6,510,458 B1).

As to claim 1, Beranek teaches one or more processing (a web document, col 2, ln 25-50/col 9,l n 7-47/ col 10, 21-67), development project (the browser, col 10, ln 21-67/col 2, ln 25-50/ col 13, ln 40-67), chains (data stream, col 13, ln 40-67), execution (running, col 2, ln 19-53/ the dynamic HTML function may be activated upon given occurrence, col 10, ln 21-55).

Beranek does not explicit teach caching those filter chains. However, Berstis teaches filtering the web page to determine then the currently web pages are saved to the cache (col 19, ln 45- 67/ col 21, ln 30-41).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Berstis to Beranek in order to provide a small, fast memory holding recently accessed data and to speed up subsequent access to the data.

As to storage medium of claim 10, see the rejection of claim 1.

As to storage medium and an execution unit of claim 11, see the rejection of claim 1.

As to the method of claim 19, see the rejection of claim 4.

2. Claims **2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 14, 15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beranek et al (US. Patent 6,226,642 B1) in view of Berstis et al (US. Patent 6,510,458 B1) in view of McLean (Data processing system and method for analysis of financial and non-financial value creation and value realization performance of provisioning of real-time assurance report) and further in view of McAllister (US. Patent 6,253,288 B1).

As to claim 2, Bernanek teaches a sources (a web document, col 2, ln 25-50/col 9,l n 7-47/ col 10, 21-67), one or more cache (col 12, ln 1-39), the source (the document requested, col 12, ln 1-39), the one or more processing chains (HTML stream, col 11, ln 55-67).

Bernanek does not teach the next M seconds of the development project. However, McLean teaches the future event (col 2, ln 44-62).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of McLean to Bernanek in order to measure and report future streams for all key stakeholders.

Bernanek does not teach pointer location. However, McAllister teaches a pointer (col 4,l n 1-25/ col 3, ln 50-67/ Fig. 2).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of McAllister to Bernanek in order to retrieve the data from the address, which is equal or close to the address associated with the data.

As to claim 3, Bernanek teaches the processing chain (a web page, col 11,l n 55-67/ col 12, ln 1-51/ col 13,l n 40-67), the caches (the cache, col 12, ln 1-40), the processing requirements of the development project (the user desires to obtain a web page/ the browser, col 12, ln 1-38).

As to claim 4, Bernanek teaches one or more the processing object (the font of the data/ the sounds, col 12, ln 1-60/ col 9, ln7-45).

As to claim 5, Bernanek teaches a processing chain (data stream, col 13, ln 40-67).

As to claim 6, bernanek teaches a call (an HTTP get request, col 13, ln 1-51).

Bernanek does not teach a call as future call. However, McLean teaches the future event (col 2, ln 44-62).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of McLean to Bernanek in order to measure and report future streams for all key stakeholders.

As to claim 7, Bernanek does not teach the future execution of a future development project. However, McLean teaches future events for generating the outcome display (col 2, ln 44-62).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of McLean to Bernanek in order to measure and report future streams for all key stakeholders.

As to claim 8, Betnanek teaches a unique identifier (the HTML tag, col 10, ln 21-65/ col 13, ln 1-10/ col 9, ln 47-67).

Bernanek does not teach a pointer. However, McAllister teaches a pointer (col 4,l n 1-25/ col 3, ln 50-67/ Fig. 2).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of McAllister to Bernanek in order to retrieve the data from the address, which is equal or close to the address associated with the data.

As to claim 9, Bernanek teaches a source file handle/ a source file name, a random numeric identifier (numerical attribute, col 13, ln 1-11).

As to a method of claim 14, see the rejection of claim 8.

As to a method of claim 15, see the rejection of claim 9.

3. Claims **12, 13, 16-18, 20, 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beranek et al (US. Patent 6,226,642 B1)

As to claim 12, Bernanek teaches a source (a web document, col 10, ln 20-67), a development project (the browser, col 10,l n 21-67), chain (data stream (col 13, ln 41-67).

Bernanek does not explicit teach the term caching the source chain when it id not currently required in the development project. However, Bernanek teaches the caching proxy receives the web documents then using the filtering mechanism 229 to determine the required web document (col 10, ln 21-67). It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Bernanek in order to save the entire web documents to the caches and then filtering the required wed documents for the web browser to use.

As to claim 13, Bernanek teaches the processing chain (the web document, col 10, ln 21-67), the development (the browser, col 10, ln 21-67).

As to claim 16, Bernanek teaches a source processing chain/ a suitable processing chain (the document requested, col 12, ln 1-55), a caches (the cache, col 12, ln 1- 55).

As to claim 17, Bernanek teach processing chain (the web document, col 9, ln 7-47), the development project (the browser, col 9, ln 7-47).

As to claim 18, Bernanek teaches one or more attributes (the web document/ one or more characteristics, col 10, ln 21-67/ col 9, ln 7-4), the development project (the browser, col 10, ln 21-67/ col 9, ln 7-4).

As to storage medium of claim 20, see the rejection of claim 12.

As to storage medium and an execution unit of claim 21, see the rejection of claim 12.

4. Claim **22** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beranek et al (US. Patent 6,226,642 B1) in view of Robinson (User communication and monitoring system for computer networks)

As to claim 22, Bernanek teaches a plurality of sources (HTML data stream, Fig. 9), a processing chain (a web document, col 2, ln 25-50/col 9,l n 7-47/ col 10, 21-6), an interface (the

client machine/ the hard drive 220, col 8, ln 6-67/ Fig.3), a development project (browser 223, Fig. 3), plurality of media source (audio data streams, col 14, ln 20-50), a point (running, col 2, ln 20-67), unload at least a subset of the chains when they are not required (filter 299 received all a web document from the server then a test can be used to identify the web document for use on the client browser, col 10, ln 21-68).

Bernanek does not explicit teach generate a development project. However, Robison teaches generating at least one screen (page 1, ln 21-40)/page 2, left col, ln 1-40).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Robison to Bernanek in order to support the opening of communication in any medium between any users and a server.

5. Claims **23, 24-28, 30- 33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beranek et al (US. Patent 6,226,642 B1) in view of Robinson (User communication and monitoring system for computer networks) in view of Thompson (US. Patent 5,961,602) and further in view of McLean (Data processing system and method for analysis of financial and non-financial value creation and value realization performance of provisioning of real-time assurance report)

As to claim 23, Bernanek does not teach load the processing chains if a current chain count does not exceed a threshold T. However, Thompson teaches content is being downloaded to the cache form the servers if the activity level for the communication link is less than a threshold level (col 13, ln 1-18).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Thompson to, Bernanek in order to ensure the each of the servers of set has a fair share of opportunities to deliver content to the Web client.

Bernanek does not teach the next M seconds of the development project. However, McLean teaches the future event (col 2, ln 44-62).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of McLean to Bernanek in order to measure and report future streams for all key stakeholders.

As to claim 24, Bernanek teaches a processing chain (data stream, col 13, ln 40-67).

As to claim 25, Bernanek teach identifies one or more currently loaded chains that can be unload (filter 299 received all a web document from the server then a test can be used to identify the web document for use on the client browser, col 10, ln 21-68).

As to claim 26, Bernanek teaches identifier one or more currently loaded chains (a negative out come… passes the retrieved web document back to server, col 10, ln 21-67).

As to claim 27, Bernanek teaches the identified one or more chains will be required (if the outcome of the test is positive, col 10, ln 20-65/ col 11, ln 55-68), caches the identified chains (the modified HTML stream to the client proxy to cached, col 11, ln 55-68).

As to a system of claim 28, see the rejection of claim 14.

As to claim 30, Bernanek teaches searching a cache of processing chains for a suitable match (retrieve information from the caches, col 12, ln 1-50), a suitable match (the document request, col 12, ln 1-50).

As to claim 31, Bernanek teaches the processing chain (the HTLM document, col 10, ln 21-46), memory with the processing project (the client browser, col 10, ln 21- 46).

As to claim 32, Bernanek teaches one or more attributes (one or more characteristics of original HTML, col 10, ln 21-46), the processing project (the browser, col 10, ln 21- 46).

As to claim 33, Bernanek teaches one or more the processing object (the font of the data/ the sounds, col 12, ln 1-60/ col 9, ln7-45).

6. Claim **29** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Beranek et al (US. Patent 6,226,642 B1) in view of Robinson (User communication and monitoring system for computer networks) in view of Thompson (US. Patent 5,961,602) in view of Anderson (Data processing system and method for analysis of financial and non-financial value creation and value realization performance of provisioning of real-time assurance report) and further in view of Sears (Browser proxy client application service provider (ASP) interface).

As to claim 29, Bernanek teaches active project (the client browser, col 10, ln 21- 46), chains (data stream, col 13, ln 40-67).

Bernanek does not explicit teach removes, caches the removed chains. However, Sears teaches a caching module configured to selectively capture the data... the captured data inaccessible to the corresponding user (col 17, ln 26-67).

It would have been obvious to apply the teaching of Sear to Bernanek in order to provide very high-speed presentation of substantially every image that has been presented to user from Internet access.

7. ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to LeChi Truong whose telephone number is (703) 305 5312. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 - 5.

Fax phone: AFTER_FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to: (703) 746-2738, OFFICAL faxes must be signed and send to: (703) 746-7239, NON OFFICIAL faxes should not be signed, please send to: (703) 746-7240

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305 9000.

LeChi Truong
September 19, 2003